

CHEMICALS



INTEROFFICE / LAKE CHARLES

TO Frank Ludden

DATE February 22, 1978

FROM H. B. Lovejoy, M.D.

SUBJECT Women in Industry

The subject of "Women in Industry" came up at the Health and Toxicology Committee meeting of the Chlorine Institute held in Houston on February 14, 1978. I was surprised and disturbed when I learned that of all the various companies represented there that we, PPG in Lake Charles, are the only ones permitting women of child-bearing ability to work in either the chlorinated organics area or the lead or mercury areas.

Our environmental control is excellent, yet the possibility of unexpected exposure remains. It is my feeling therefore that until such time as the courts on EEO say we must, we should not permit women capable of bearing children to work in any of these areas. This would not exclude post-menopausal or post-hysterectomized women as the purpose is to protect an unborn fetus.

At present we have four women assigned to 60A (Organics operations). All of these would have to be moved. I suggest this be done as soon as practical, and that we not propose any other women to work in this area. There are no women assigned either to the mercury cell area or the diaphragm cell repair (molten lead) area. I feel that maintenance supervisors could arrange assignments for those who should be restricted in their department.

You will recall that I have been opposed to allowing these women to work in these areas. I have no record as to when we began this policy but our first exam was done August 10, 1976. I recall that we said we would employ these women into the utility crew and then discourage them from bidding on organics area jobs.

Our biggest problem remains in the laboratory where we have many fertile females. I feel we should not be less restrictive there but encourage Dr. Hoenes to shift such women to non-feto-hazardous jobs and have potentially hazardous work done by the sterile women or the men in the department.

/lb

cc: Murry Davis  
Jim Farst

SL 073004

~~O. L. CROWEANS~~  
~~F. G. TAYLOR~~  
~~E. G. LUDWIG~~  
~~R. P. LYNN~~

R. F. KASPER  
 J. M. DAVIS  
 H. B. LOVEYOR

REC 8/9

## OCCUPATIONAL SAFETY &amp; HEALTH REPORTER

► June 22-24. Braniff Place, Terrace Suite, 1500 Canal St., New Orleans, La. 70140.

► June 29-July 1. Department of Labor, OSHA, 1515 Broadway, Room 3560, New York, N.Y. 10036.

The meetings will begin at 10:00 a.m. and will continue until 5:00 p.m. Evening sessions will be held from 6:30 p.m. to 8:30 p.m. OSHA should be notified in advance by persons or organizations desiring to testify, the amount of time required, the subject matter to be discussed, and a brief summary of the testimony.

Written notice of desire to testify should be sent to Office of Standards Development, Docket D, OSHA, Room N3718, Department of Labor, 200 Constitution Ave., NW, Washington, D.C. 20210, no later than two weeks before the schedule meeting date.

As long as time permits, all persons who wish to be heard may testify, but priority will be given to those who register in advance.

#### OSHA Comparative Analysis

The announcement included an analysis of comments on various sections of Subpart D placed side-by-side with the appropriate sections of the current standard.

This analysis will appear in a future Full Text section of this report.

#### Health Hazards

#### NIOSH STUDIES REVEAL HAZARDS TO WOMEN OF CHILD-BEARING AGE

Over one million women of child-bearing age are working in jobs which could expose them to chemical substances, including anesthetic gases, lead, benzene, and methyl mercury, which might cause birth defects and miscarriages.

This was revealed by John Finklea, director of the National Institute of Occupational Safety and Health, in response to questions by Congressman David Obey (D-Wis.) during hearings on NIOSH appropriations for fiscal 1977.

Finklea said NIOSH "is proposing to give special emphasis to women and the fetus and male fertility as influenced by the working environment."

The institute plans to incorporate into its ongoing research and standards proposals "a special emphasis on carcinogenesis (including transplacental carcinogenesis), mutagenesis, and teratogenesis particularly as related to pregnant women and the fetus."

Finklea said that over 20 agents from the NIOSH toxic substances list have been tested for their effect on unborn children. The majority of chemicals for which there are standards have not been tested in this area.

Most of the threshold limit values which were adopted as standards were not established with the intention of protecting women of child-bearing age in the workplace. There are about 16 million such women in the labor force who are between the ages of 16 to 34, Finklea said.

NIOSH already has begun discussing with the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission the potential employment discrimination problems that could result from standards that would single out such women.

NIOSH studies also suggest a relationship between exposure to vinyl chloride and birth defects and miscarriage, and a standard already exists for this substance in this area.

Testimony before the House appropriations subcommittee also revealed that NIOSH is taking an initiative to develop recommended standards for carcinogenesis, mutagenesis, and teratogenesis, requiring employer reporting, medical monitoring, labeling, or other measures that might provide

data and at least some employee protection until standards with a threshold limit value are established. (See related article in this report.)

In response to a question by Congressman William Natcher (D-Ky.), Finklea explained that about 75 percent of NIOSH's criteria documents are prepared under contract and that the other quarter are done in-house.

Finklea said that reforms in the system for preparing these criteria documents should cut their preparation time from a year or more to an average of between 26 and 30 weeks.

NIOSH said that it has not had any feedback about deficiencies in its criteria documents from the Occupational Safety and Health Administration, with the exception of the heat stress document which was returned with only general comments. OSHA has made general statements that it would like to see more information about feasibility.

NIOSH expects to see more comments about deficiencies in the documents, since OSHA is not initiating rules for them.

Following is a listing of the criteria documents that NIOSH expects to complete in fiscal 1976, as given to the House appropriations subcommittee.

Acetylene  
 Allyl chloride  
 Anesthetic gases  
 Anilines  
 Boron trifluoride  
 Carbaryl  
 Chlorine  
 Dioxane  
 Ethylene dichloride  
 Formaldehyde  
 Logging (felling to first haul)  
 Malathion  
 Methyl alcohol  
 Methylene chloride  
 Methyl parathion  
 Nitric acid  
 Parathion  
 Phenol  
 Phosgene, Tetrachloroethylene (perchloroethylene)

#### Anhydrous Ammonia

#### OSHA ISSUES INFORMATION REQUEST FOR MORE DATA ON ANHYDROUS AMMONIA

The Occupational Safety and Health Administration announced on April 19 that fact-finding meetings will be held to assist in developing data for proposed revisions to rules covering the storage and handling of anhydrous ammonia.

The revisions, which pertain to 1910.111 and 1910.267, are necessary to comply with current technological advances since inception of the current rule in 1972, OSHA said.

Development of additional data for the revisions will involve the utilization of new procedures, including fact-finding hearings, initiated by OSHA for certain safety standards. (See related article in this issue.) Current standards for the storage and handling of anhydrous ammonia will continue in full force and effect in the interim.

#### General Issues

The OSHA announcement, to be published on April 23, stated that the following general issues relate to the planned revisions of the anhydrous ammonia rules:

► Whether particular provisions should be revoked because they have little relevance to worker safety and

relate instead to property protection or protection of the general public.

- ▶ Whether particular provisions need simplification or clarification.
- ▶ Whether particular provisions should set forth specifications which must be met by employer rather than requiring performance-oriented provisions.
- ▶ Whether there are gaps in OSHA's coverage in 1910.111 which could result in unsafe workplaces.
- ▶ How standards of the American National Standards Institute should be utilized in the OSHA rules.

#### Specific Issues

In addition to the general issues, OSHA is soliciting comments on the following specific issues:

- ▶ Whether OSHA should require the use of special equipment to protect container valves against accidental opening.
- ▶ Whether OSHA should require the periodic testing of equipment.
- ▶ Whether remote venting of container relief valves should be required.
- ▶ Whether mandatory guarding of all external container appurtenances should be required.
- ▶ Whether workers engaged in ammonia transfer operations should be required to carry a small water supply for emergency use.
- ▶ Whether rules should provide for training of workers.
- ▶ Whether the current rule adequately protects workers against accidents on vehicle-mounted systems caused by hose interference with moving parts.
- ▶ Whether workers applying anhydrous ammonia to the soil should be protected by the same rules.
- ▶ Whether workers applying and handling anhydrous ammonia on the farm should have the same protection regardless of whether they work for the farmer or for the distributor.
- ▶ Should coverage under 1910.111 be limited strictly to anhydrous ammonia rather than other forms such as aqua ammonia.
- ▶ Whether the ammonia standard proposed by OSHA last November (Current Report, November 27, p. 895) should be applied to workers in operations covered by 1910.111.

#### Public Participation

OSHA invited public participation on the revisions in the form of comments on the current standard or the issues raised by the announcement.

Written comments should be sent to the Office of Standards Development, Docket AA, OSHA, Room N3718, Department of Labor, 200 Constitution Ave., NW, Washington, D.C. 20210.

In addition to the request for written information, OSHA is scheduling several public meetings at various locations around the country to afford the public an opportunity to submit data and views. The meetings will be held on the dates and at the locations listed below:

- ▶ June 17-18. Holiday Inn, 5202 Brady St., Davenport, Iowa 52804.
- ▶ June 24-25. Marriott Hotel, 6363 Hamden Ave., Denver, Colo. 80222.

The meetings will begin at 10 a.m. and will continue until 5 p.m. Evening sessions will be held from 6:30 p.m. to 8:30 p.m. OSHA should be notified in advance by persons or organizations desiring to testify, the amount of time required, the subject matter to be discussed, and a brief summary of the testimony.

Written notice of desire to testify should be sent to the Office of Standards Development, Docket AA, OSHA, Room N3718, Department of Labor, 200 Constitution Ave., NW,

Washington, D.C. 20210 no later than two weeks before the scheduled meeting date.

As long as time permits, all persons who wish to be heard may testify, but priority will be given to those who register in advance.

The announcement included an analysis of comments on various section of 1910.111 placed side-by-side with the appropriate sections of the current standard.

This analysis will appear in a future Full Text section of the Current Report.

#### Fire Protection

##### OSHA FIRE PROTECTION REGULATIONS TO BE REVISED: PUBLIC MEETINGS SCHEDULED

The Occupational Safety and Health Administration announced on April 19 that fact-finding meetings will be held to assist in developing data for proposed revisions to rules covering fire protection.

The revisions, which pertain to Subpart L of the Occupational Safety and Health Standards (1910.156-165b), are needed to update current rules and to reflect comment received on these rules.

Development of additional data for the revisions will involve the utilization of new procedures, including fact-finding hearings, initiated by OSHA for certain safety standards. (See related story in this issue.) Current standards on fire protection will continue in full force and effect in the interim.

#### General Issues

The OSHA announcement stated that the following general issues relate to the planned revisions of Subpart L:

- ▶ Whether particular provisions should be revoked because they have little relevance to worker safety and relate instead to property protection or safety of the general public.
- ▶ Whether particular provisions need simplification or clarification.
- ▶ Whether there are gaps in Subpart L which would result in unsafe working conditions.
- ▶ Whether particular provisions should include specifications to be met by the employers rather than requiring performance-oriented provisions.
- ▶ How standards of the American National Standards Institute and the National Fire Protection Association should be utilized in the OSHA rules.

#### Specific Issues

In addition to the general issues, OSHA is soliciting comments on the following specific issues:

- ▶ Whether Subpart L should require the use of fixed and portable fire suppression and alarm systems and equipment.
- ▶ What changes should be made in existing rules for fire extinguisher equipment.
- ▶ What changes should be made in existing rules for stand-pipe and hose systems.
- ▶ Whether total flooding systems in fixed extinguishing equipment using agents hazardous to workers should be covered by OSHA.
- ▶ What changes should be made in existing rules for detectors and fire alarm systems.

#### Public Participation

OSHA invited public participation on the revisions to Subpart L in the form of comments on the current standard or the issues raised in the announcement.

Written comments should be sent to the Office of Standards Development, Docket L, OSHA, Room N3718, Department of Labor, 200 Constitution Ave., NW, Washington, D.C. 20210.

In addition to its request for written information, OSHA is scheduling several public meetings at various locations around the country to afford the public an opportunity to submit data and views. The meetings will be held on the dates and at the locations listed below:

► June 9-10. Towne House, Gordon Lounge, 8th & Market, San Francisco, Calif. 94102.

► June 16-17. Fairmont Hotel, Gold Room, Ross & Akard, Dallas, Tex. 75201.

► June 23-24. Fanueil Hall, Merchants Row, Fanueil Square, Boston, Mass. 02201.

The meetings will begin at 10 a.m. and will continue until 5 p.m. Evening sessions will be held from 6:30 p.m. to 8:30 p.m. OSHA should be notified in advance by persons or organizations desiring to testify, the amount of time required, the subject matter to be discussed, and a brief summary of the testimony.

Written notice of desire to testify should be sent to the Office of Standards Development, Docket L, OSHA, Room N3718, Department of Labor, 200 Constitution Ave., NW, Washington, D.C. 20210 no later than two weeks before the scheduled meeting date.

As long as time permits, all persons who wish to be heard may testify, but priority will be given to those who register in advance.

The announcement included an analysis of comments on various sections of Subpart L placed side-by-side with the appropriate sections of the current standard.

This analysis will appear in a future Full Text section of the Current Report.

### Research

#### NIOSH TO REQUEST SCIENTIFIC DATA ON SUSPECTED MUTAGENS, TERATOGENS

A request for information on suspected mutagenic and/or teratogenic substances will be issued by the National Institute for Occupational Safety and Health.

NIOSH will request data from human, animal, microbial, host-mediated, tissue, and other relevant studies to evaluate the potential of the compounds to produce mutagenic and/or teratogenic effects in humans. Information should be sent to the Acting Director, Division of Criteria Documentation and Standards Development, NIOSH, 5600 Fishers Lane, Park Building, Room 3-18, Rockville, Md. 20852.

All information received will be available for public inspection at that address, except for information which is trade secret and protected by Section 15 of the Occupational Safety and Health Act.

The list of substances follows.

2-Acetylaminofluorene (2-AAF) (AB94500 Acetamide, N-Fluorenyl-2-YL)

Arsenic and compounds (asAs) (CG12250 Arsenic Acid, Sodium Salt) (CG36750 Arsenious Acid, Monosodium Salt)

Cadmium dusts (EV01750 Cadmium Chloride) (EV27000 Cadmium Sulfate)

Carbaryl (Sevin) (FC 59500 Carbamic Acid, Methyl-, 1-Naphthyl Ester)

Carbon dioxide (FF64000)

Chloroform (Trichloromethane) (FS91000)

Chloroprene (2-chloro-1,3 butadiene) (EI96250 1,3-Butadiene, 2-Chloro-)

2,4D (AG68250 Acetic Acid, (2,4-Dichlorophenoxy)-)

DDT (KJ33250 Ethane, 1,1,1-Trichloro-2,2-Bis(p-Chlorophenyl)-)

Dementon (Systox) (TF31500 Phosphorothioic Acid, O,O-Diethyl O-(2-(Ethylthio) Ethyl) Ester, mixed with O,O-Diethyl S-(2-(Ethylthio)Ethylr Ester)

Dibutylphthalate (TI08750 Phthalic Acid, Dibutyl Ester)

Dimethyl acetamide (AB77000 Acetamide, N,N-Dimethyl-)

Dimethylphthalate (TI15750 Phthalic Acid, Dimethyl Ester)

Dimethylsulfate (WS82250 Sulfuric Acid, Dimethyl Ester)

Di-sec-octyl phthalate (Di-2-ethylhexylphthalate)

(TI03500 Phthalic Acid, Bis(2-Ethylhexyl)Ester)

Ethylene oxide (KX24500)

Mercury (OW12250 Mercury, Chloromethyl-)

mMethyl styrene (WL50750 Styrene, Methyl-)

Monomethyl hydrazine (MV56000 Hydrazine, Methyl-)

Nicotine (QS52500)

N-Nitrosodimethylamine (DMN) (IQ05250 Dimethylamine, N-Nitroso-)

Lead and its inorganic compounds (OG21000 Lead (I I) Nitrate)

Paraquat (DW22750 4,4', Bipyridinium, 1,1'-Dimethyl-, Dichloride)

Parathion (TF45500 Phosphorothioic Acid, O,O-Diethyl O-(p-Nitrophenyl)Ester)

2,4,5T (AJ84000 Acetic Acid, (2,4,5-Trichlorophenoxy)-)

Thiram (JO14000 Disulfide, Bis(Dimethylthiocarbamoyl)

### Health Hazards

#### OSHA ASKS FOR NEW INFORMATION ON TWO SOLVENTS USED IN DEGREASING

The Occupational Safety and Health Administration issued a request for information and comment on two solvents used in degreasing operations on April 16.

The solvents, 1,1,2,2 tetrachloroethylene and 1,1,1 trichloroethane, are similar in nature and usage to trichloroethylene in that all of the substances are chlorinated hydrocarbon solvents. A rule for trichloroethylene was proposed by OSHA last October (Current Report, October 16, p. 635).

According to the notice, OSHA is considering whether revised standards for the solvents should be developed separately or in conjunction with the trichloroethylene proposal. Some comments on the proposed rule for trichloroethylene received by OSHA suggested that users of the substance might switch to other chlorinated hydrocarbon solvents such as 1,1,2,2 tetrachloroethylene and 1,1,1 trichloroethane in order to avoid the more stringent requirements for trichloroethylene.

Some comments also suggested that the three substances possess similar toxicological properties.

#### Request for Information

Interested persons are invited by OSHA to submit written data, views, and arguments concerning a standard for 1,1,2,2 tetrachloroethylene and 1,1,1 trichloroethane. Comments are requested specifically in the following areas:

► Whether new standards for the two solvents should be developed and, if so, what the contents of the revisions should be.

► Whether these standards should be developed separately or in conjunction with trichloroethylene.

► The carcinogenicity, if any, of the solvents.

- The economic and inflation impact of these standards.
- Any other related issues.

Communications should be addressed to the Docket Officer, Room N3620, Occupational Safety and Health Administration, Department of Labor, 200 Constitution Ave., NW, Washington, D.C. 20210, postmarked no later than May 17, 1976. The communications will be available for public inspection at that address.

According to the notice, OSHA does not foresee a substantial delay in issuing a final rule for trichloroethylene regardless of whether the solvents are treated separately or together.

#### Health Hazards

##### MORE LEUKEMIA DEATHS REPORTED IN RUBBER INDUSTRY; MEETING SCHEDULED

A meeting of union, industry, and government officials concerning deaths of workers in the rubber industry from leukemia will be held April 30 at the Holiday Inn Riverfront, in Cincinnati, Ohio, at 8:30 a.m.

The meeting was urged following a preliminary investigation by the National Institute for Occupational Safety and Health of leukemia deaths reported at the B. F. Goodrich Company, and Texas U.S. Chemical Company plants at Port Neches, Tex. (Current Report, April 15, p. 1491).

The manufacture of styrene-butadiene rubber was implicated initially. In a possibly related development, The Goodyear Tire and Rubber Company in Akron, Ohio, reported seven deaths from leukemia over a 10-year period.

A NIOSH team will investigate the Akron plant and examine death certificates. Reportedly, the deaths at Goodyear represent a mortality rate more than 250 times greater than normal, and may be linked to exposure to benzene.

#### Enforcement

##### OCAW SAYS UNION CARBIDE FILED NOTICES OF CONTEST IN "BAD FAITH"

Notices of contest filed by Union Carbide Corporation following inspections at two plants "lack the prerequisite good faith" and constitute "a pattern of practice" to delay abatement and avoid penalties, according to the Oil Chemical, and Atomic Workers International Union.

The OCAW elected party status in a letter to the Occupational Safety and Health Review Commission, on April 15, and at the same time moved to have the notice of contest involving the firm's Metals Division at Marietta, Ohio, dismissed.

Citations had been issued by the Occupational Safety and Health Administration following a January 1976 inspection of the Marietta plant. They charged one serious violation, six repeated violations, and 65 items on a nonserious citation. Penalties totaling \$2,280 were proposed.

Following a conference between the OSHA area director and the firm the citations were amended to delete three nonserious items, one repeated violation and one example from one repeated violation. Also 10 nonserious items were amended as well as one repeated violation. Proposed penalties were reduced by \$50 to \$2,230.

The employer filed a notice of contest against all the violations, abatement periods, and proposed penalties. OCAW Local 3-639 elected party status on April 15, citing

the employer's actions in this case and an earlier case involving the corporation's Charleston, W.Va., plant.

The Charleston plant was inspected in February 1975 and received citations alleging one willful violation, 40 nonserious items, and six repeated violations. Penalties totaling \$18,120 were proposed.

More than a year later, following many settlement attempts, an OSAHRC judge set the case to be heard on June 29 and 30, 1976. In the respondent's final proposed settlement, dated March 18, 1976, the firm proposed to withdraw notice of contest to five of the six repeated violations (if two of the five were made nonserious), to 35 of 40 nonserious items, and to the willful violation (if reduced to serious). Union Carbide also proposed a reduction in the proposed penalties from \$18,120 to \$3,020.

The OCAW stated "this series of events demonstrates that the respondent did not initiate these review proceedings in good faith. The respondent obviously had no objection to the vast majority of the violations. Instead the respondent actually was seeking an extended abatement period and a lessening of penalties." The union referred to Section 10(b) of the law which prohibits using commission proceedings for delay or avoidance of penalties.

Steven Wodka, union legislative assistant, told OSHA the Review Commission is becoming "the bottleneck of the act." Procedures before the commission are a "mechanism for frustrating the workers," he said, and a "tool for management." Wodka said the commission has not made available any material for workers who want to use or understand its procedures. He said the Union Carbide "blanket notices of contest" to alleged violations, abatement periods, and proposed penalties were the "first true pattern of practice" that could be a test case for the commission. He was severely critical of commission procedures, particularly of "a lack of priorities." A case involving a construction accident that happened three years ago and a case involving workers continually exposed to asbestos are given the same treatment, he noted. "There is no sense of urgency at the commission," he said.

The first case was docketed as No. 12511 and the case in which the union elected party status is No. 76-1034.

#### Enforcement

##### OSHA CITATION MUST SPECIFY ACTUAL NOISE LEVELS, OSAHRC RULES

A citation for violation of the noise standards must specify the levels and locations of the excessive noise, the Occupational Safety and Health Review Commission decided.

This 2-1 ruling was issued in the case of *B. W. Harrison Lumber Company* (No. 2200) on April 14. The decision was based on the requirement of Section 9(a) of the Occupational Safety and Health Act that a citation "shall describe with particularity the nature of the violation."

The employer, a Monroe, Ga., sawmill operator, was cited by the Secretary of Labor for violations of 29 CFR 1910.95(b)(1) and (3) for failure to use feasible engineering or administrative controls to reduce excessive noise levels and for failure to provide a continuing and effective hearing conservation program. This citation was not contested and became a final order by operation of law. A second inspection was conducted, and a notification of failure to correct the original violations was issued, with proposed penalties of \$1,875. The second citation was contested.

The employer contended before Review Commission Judge John S. Patton that it was not adequately advised